JANUARY 1958

MONTHLY REVIEW

N INDEPENDENT SOCIALIST MAGAZINE

VOL. 9

9

INDIA, CHINA, AND FREEDOM

THE EDITORS

POLAND A YEAR AFTER

PAUL M. SWEEZY

CHINA'S ECONOMIC PROGRESS

SOLOMON ADLER

The Strange Powers of the Senate

GEORGE BRAND

ITORS . . . LEO HUBERMAN . . . PAUL M. SWEEZY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTENTS

VOLUME NINE NUMBER NINE JANUARY 1958

REVIEW OF THE MONTH: India, China, and Freedom 273
THE STRANGE POWERS OF THE SENATE by George Brand 282
POLAND A YEAR AFTER by Paul M. Sweezy 289
MAXIMS MORAL AND POLITICAL by Barrows Dunham 294
THE WORLD OF SCIENCE: The Sputniki by Philip Morrison 296
SOME IMPRESSIONS OF CHINA'S ECONOMIC PROGRESS by Solomon Adler 304
WORLD EVENTS by Scott Nearing 309
QUOTATIONS FROM VEBLEN 315

MONTHLY REVIEW: Published monthly and copyright, 1958, by Monthly Review, Inc.
EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS: 218 West 10th Street, New York 14, New York.
Telephone: ORegon 5-6939.
MAILING ADDRESS: 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, New York.
Address ALL communications to 66 Barrow Street.
SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: One year—$4; two years—$7.
By 1st class mail—United States $6; everywhere else $7.
By air mail—No. America $8; So. America $13; Europe $17; Asia $24.
EDITORS: Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy.

NOTES FROM THE EDITORS

Progress report on the three new Monthly Review Press publications: Scott Nearing's *Socialists Around The World* is off the press and has been mailed out to early buyers. *The South African Treason Trial* by Lionel Forman and Solly Sachs, and *A New Birth of Freedom?* by Konni Zilliacus are on the high seas, sent here in sheet form by the English publishers. As soon as they arrive they will be bound, then mailed to early buyers. Publication date of the Nearing book is January 27th, and of the other two, some time in February. *Prepublication prices prevail only until date of publication.* Save money by ordering now.

As we go to press Paul Sweezy has not yet returned from his tour of the USSR, Poland, Yugoslavia, Italy, France, and England. His first piece, on Poland, appears in this issue and other articles will follow. On January 15, he will report in person at the first Monthly Review Associates meeting of the season, at the Heywood Broun Room of the Newspaper Guild. Readers in the New York area are urged to attend with as many friends as possible. Details of the meeting, and of two others to follow later, are announced on page 319.

(*continued on inside back cover*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INDIA, CHINA, AND FREEDOM

One out of every four persons in the world is Chinese.

One out of every seven persons is Indian.

Together, the people of these two countries constitute roughly 40 percent of the population of the world.

Both countries achieved their independence from foreign rule within the last decade. We have witnessed, in our lifetime, one of the most important events in history—after centuries of colonial exploitation the yellow, brown, and black peoples have fought their way, successfully, to freedom from white rule. The process is not yet complete but the trend is unmistakable and in Asia, particularly, the battle has been won.

An equally important struggle now faces these newly independent countries. Only Japan, of all the countries in Asia, has attained the industrial level of the advanced white nations; all the others are pre-industrial, underdeveloped countries not now in a position to make the best use of their natural and human resources in terms of available technology.

They are tackling, in different ways and with varying degrees of success, the problem of transforming themselves from industrially underdeveloped to industrially advanced nations. How difficult that problem is, how great the distance from where they are to where they want to go, can be gauged from a quick look at the picture presented by India.

India is rich in natural resources, and her known supply of mineral wealth is constantly being added to as exploration teams make new finds. Thus, in March 1957, the Indian Atomic Energy Commission reported the discovery, in northwest India, of the earth's largest deposits of thorium, a radioactive element.

India's supply of high grade iron ore is the largest in the world; she produces 80 percent of the world's supply of mica; her deposits of manganese are third largest in the world; she ranks eighth among the coal-producing countries, and has plenty of alloy metals essential to the iron and steel industry; she has substantial deposits of bauxite for aluminum, and adequate supplies of chrome, lime, and gypsum, ilmenite, sillimanite, salt, clay, feldspar, and gold. But she is lacking in copper, lead, zinc, tin, and oil. She has discovered some oil but not nearly enough to supply her needs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

India has a vast supply of hydroelectric power. Her highly respected atomic scientists hope to have an atomic plant producing power by 1962.

Forty-five percent of her total area—the seventh largest country in the world—is under some kind of cultivation. She has plenty of rivers, both large and small, and 3500 miles of coastline with five major seaports. Her railway system is the fourth largest in the world.

India has, in short, practically everything necessary to make her a highly advanced, industrially developed, rich country. Yet she is desperately poor.

How desperately poor you cannot appreciate unless you have seen with your own eyes. In Calcutta, for example, you walk gingerly through the streets, choosing your steps with care lest you step on someone sleeping on the pavement. These street dwellers have no other home. Here they prepare their meals, eat, sleep, live. Not just a few unfortunates but, according to the *London Times* (January 14, 1957), these pavement dwellers "form 10 percent or more of the population of some large cities."

From your seat in a plane you look down on farm lands that remind you of Kansas or Missouri, but walk through the villages and you see most of the inhabitants living in mud huts, small, dark, without windows or chimneys or furniture or equipment except some pots for grain. Less than one percent of the 560,000 odd villages with a population of under 20,000 has electricity.

India is the most poverty-stricken country on earth. Her people are the world's most miserably clothed, most inadequately fed, most wretchedly housed, most illiterate, and most disease-ridden.

It is particularly difficult for Americans, who are so very rich by comparison, to understand what life is like for the average Indian. A few facts and figures will help to give you the picture.

Income

The annual per capita income for the roughly 380 million people in India, in 1956, was around Rs. 281 or about $59. That comes to roughly $5 a month or 17¢ a day. That's what the average Indian had to eat, drink, and be merry on; that's what he had to spend for food, clothing, and shelter; for transportation, medicine, education; for cigarettes, movies, fun.

You understand that the $5 a month figure is *average* income. That means there were many people in India who got less than that. Some 50 million people or between 1/7 and 1/8 of the total population had less than $2 a month. (In October 1957, average *hourly* earnings, including overtime, of factory workers in the United States were $2.08.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Most of India's poor live in the villages where per capita income is estimated to be 1/3 to 1/2 that of the cities. One out of five farmers owns no land. These are the landless laborers who find work only in the busy seasons, which means that they are idle 1/3 to 1/2 of the year.

Farm holdings are small, more than half consisting of less than 2.5 acres. The yield per acre is very low. The tools are primitive, seeds are poor, methods of cultivation are backward. It is estimated that 40 percent of the Indian peasantry do not get more than one meal a day. Small, uneconomic holdings are made even smaller by subletting, rents are too high, and though laws have been passed against exorbitant interest rates on crop loans, not enough credit societies have yet been set up and usury continues.

Although India has more cattle than any other nation, the animals are as poor as the people. The average cow in Switzerland gives 14 times as much milk as an Indian cow. Only 1/6 of the immense cattle population give any milk at all; another 1/5 are valueless for any purpose except that they produce dung which is widely used as fuel. Indeed, 75 percent of India's power is generated by burning cow dung.

In the rural areas, the unemployed and the underemployed together come to about 11½ million people; in the urban areas there are another 2½ million, making a total of 14 million who have no work at all or not enough.

Education

There is at present no compulsory education in India. About 83 percent of the population 10 years old and over is illiterate. This means that only one out of every six persons above 10 years of age is able to read and write—no other country has such a high rate of illiteracy.

Since school facilities exist for only 51 percent of the children in age group 6 to 11, roughly half could not attend primary school even if their parents wanted them to. At the middle, high school, and university levels, the figures are even more staggering: roughly 80 percent of the children aged 11 to 14 do not attend school; 91 percent of the children of high school age, 14 to 17, do not attend school; and more than 99 percent of the men and women of university age, 17 to 23, do not attend school.

Health

The situation in respect to health—or rather in respect to sickness and death—is as horrible as would be expected in a country so poverty-stricken.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1952, food consumption in the United States was 3120 calories per person per day. That was well over the estimate of 2200 calories needed for preventing undernutrition. But in India in 1952, food consumption per person per day was only 1690 calories. The poor spend most of their income for an unhealthy diet consisting mostly of cereals and starchy roots. They seldom get milk, meat, fish, eggs, greens, and fruit. Most of the people are both undernourished and malnourished.

Every minute of every day, for 24 hours around the clock, a person dies of tuberculosis in India.

Half the people in the world suffering from leprosy are Indians. Two million have the disease and there is room in the sanatoria for only 20,000.

Average expectancy of life is 69.6 years in the United States. It is 32 years in India, the lowest in the world.

Now this, it cannot be denied, is the picture of a poor country, an underdeveloped country. This was the state of the nation which the Indians who had fought for independence took over on August 15, 1947, after 200 years of British rule. And China, with variations in degree, was in roughly the same underdeveloped state when the Communists came to power in October 1949.

In both nations there was a determination to climb out of the sinkhole of poverty, disease, and ignorance, to modernize, to introduce whatever institutional changes were necessary for rapid economic development. For the Chinese Communists the pattern was clear—the Soviet Union had shown the way and China had only to follow in her footsteps, avoiding the pitfalls, and making allowances for differences in social and historical background.

For India the road ahead was not so clearly outlined. The Congress Party which came to power when the British abdicated was a mixture of many elements with different aims. Its leadership was mainly bourgeois: some, genuine patriots who had fought for freedom from foreign rule out of love of country and at great personal sacrifice; others, to whom the fight for freedom meant *their* freedom, the freedom to add to their smaller share of the wealth of India the larger part which the British capitalists had plundered.

Mahatma Gandhi, the revered leader of the independence movement, was not a socialist but he was, in his own way, a staunch fighter for social justice. Nehru, the other big leader of the independence movement, was a convinced socialist. And with him in the Congress Party were other socialists and communists who felt that the fight for independence was only the first step on the path to freedom, that other steps must also be taken leading to the ultimate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

goal of a social and economic revolution. The workers and peasants joined the independence movement for its promise of a better life.

With the assassination of Gandhi, Nehru became the idol of the people. He has proved the champion vote-getter and those in the Congress Party who do not share his views on how best to industrialize India, realize that they had better go along with him or face the possibility of seeing groups that are even farther Left come into power.

India's tradition of non-violence to which Nehru subscribes meant that the Chinese Communist path of political and social revolution would not be the method chosen to effect the far-reaching changes necessary to economic development. But the capitalist methods of free enterprise could not be chosen, either, for the simple reason that they were not suited to the task. Dynamic entrepreneurs as we have known them in America and the advanced countries of Europe simply do not exist in the underdeveloped regions of Asia. The government of India *had* to take over the entrepreneurial role or the job that had to be done could never be done. The basic program that must be undertaken—the building of huge dams and irrigation projects, heavy investment in steel and machine-building plants—is so tremendous in scope, so difficult and risky, that few capitalists, even if they could command the skilled manpower and technical know-how, would dare to take the risk. The mobilization of the maximum possible economic surplus and the stepping up of investment into properly-directed channels could be only the government's responsibility. Otherwise the task could not be accomplished.

This political and economic background helps to make clear why India chose a "mixed economy." Just as she stands between the capitalist and socialist worlds in foreign policy, so in her mixed economy the means of production are both privately and publicly owned. In her Second Five Year Plan which went into effect on April 1, 1956, India maintains and even encourages the "private sector" of the economy but at the same time calls for the expansion of the "public sector," and announces as the goal to be achieved "a socialist pattern of society." The planners give this meaning to that phrase:

> The basic criterion for determining the lines of advance must not be private profit but social gain, and the pattern of development and structure of socio-economic relations should be so planned that they may result not only in appreciable increases in national income and employment, but also in greater equality in income and wealth. Major decisions regarding production, distribution, consumption, and investment—and in fact all significant socio-economic relationships—must be made by agencies informed by social purpose. The benefits of economic

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development must accrue more and more to the relatively less privileged classes of society, and there should be a progressive reduction of the concentration of incomes, wealth, and economic power. . . .

For creating the appropriate conditions, the State has to take on heavy responsibilities as the principal agency speaking for, and acting on behalf of, the community as a whole. The public sector has to expand rapidly. It has not only to initiate developments which the private sector is unwilling or unable to undertake, it has to play the dominant role in shaping the entire pattern of investments in the economy, whether it makes the investments directly, or whether they are made by the private sector. The private sector has to play its part within the framework of the comprehensive plan accepted by the community. . . .

The socialist pattern of society is not to be regarded as some fixed or rigid pattern. It is not rooted in any doctrine or dogma. Each country has to develop according to its own genius and tradition. . . . It is neither necessary nor desirable that the economy should become a monolithic type of organization offering little play for experimentation either as to forms or as to modes of functioning. Nor should expansion of the public sector mean centralization of decision-making and of exercise of authority. (Second Five Year Plan, Government of India Planning Commission, 1956, pp. 22, 23.)

The historical setting for the attempt by both India and China to develop their economies is such that comparisons are inevitable. They are the two most populous countries in the world, both recently liberated from centuries of imperialist exploitation; they set out on a planned industrialization program at about the same time from roughly the same starting place; they are friendly neighbors, united in their determination to succeed, each in its own way. One point of difference in their philosophies is shown in the last paragraph of the quotation above. Another fundamental difference, as the Indians see it, was expressed by S. K. Dey, Minister for Community Development, to C. L. Sulzberger of the *New York Times* (March 6, 1957):

> The only country in the world with which India can now be compared and with which it is running a kind of race—in a constructive way—is China. They introduced curtailment of liberty for their people in order to reconstruct their economy. They say they hope complete freedom of the individual can later be restored.
>
> We believe, on the other hand, that we should use only persuasion, not coercion. Our progress may not be fast at the start; but we hope ultimately it will catch up at a rate of geometric progression. Whether we succeed still remains to be seen. We

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are trying to find out whether it is possible to build a monolithic instrument of action based upon a democratic instrument of decision.

It is beginning to dawn upon some high-ranking people in the Western world that this "race" between India and China is of the utmost importance and that they have a stake in it. For the evidence already at hand gives a clear indication that China is far in the lead—her rate of economic expansion is such as to ensure her a place among the foremost industrial nations of the world in a matter of decades.

India's mixed economy, on the other hand, is in serious difficulties. India needs help—lots of it—to fulfill the modest targets set in the Five Year Plan. Her foreign exchange deficit is roughly $1.5 billion dollars. Since the outlook for raising that sum is not bright, she hopes to raise half of it, enough to save the hard core of the plan—her three steel mills planned for the public sector, her power and irrigation developments, and her expansion plans for railways and ports.

Aid in the form of grants and loans has come to India from the United States but in the context of India's capital requirements, United States aid is not large (nothing like what has been poured into South Korea and Formosa). In the eyes of some of our top officials, India does not qualify for help from the United States. Her policy of neutrality is in their eyes a crime—"if you're not on our side, you're against us." Not comprehending that the development needs of India cannot be satisfied in the same way and with the same mechanism that worked in the United States (in a different period under different conditions), they pontificate that "India has created a climate highly prejudicial to normal economic development." (*Fortune,* November 1957, p. 101.) As we pointed out in an earlier discussion of this subject (Foreign Aid—US vs. USSR, MONTHLY REVIEW, February 1956), Americans "have no faith in the competence of the peoples who inhabit the underdeveloped countries and actually think they are doing them a favor by telling them how to run their economies."

Increasingly, however, the possible consequences of India's losing the race are becoming apparent to more and more people in high places. In an interview with John P. Callahan, reported in the *New York Times* on September 17, 1957, Mr. G. D. Birla, one of India's most prominent industrialists, laid it on the line so his American counterparts would understand:

"Unless we can further develop our ports and expand our railway facilities, which efforts require foreign economic assist-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ance, our industrial program will be stymied. We need these facilities for expansion."

Pointing to the State of Kerala, which was lost to the Communist party in the recent national elections, Mr. Birla said, "Without immediate economic aid other Indian states that are grossly underdeveloped will face the same threat.

"We in India are the greatest citadel in Asia against the spread of communism," he remarked and added:

"There is a silent race between India, a democratic state, and China, a totalitarian state, for industrialization. Asia will judge democracy on the success of India's Second Five Year Plan. It is more than a monetary question—it is a matter of life and death."

That is what Chester Bowles has been warning his countrymen for a long time. And he has been joined by Walter Lippmann, the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, and the *New York Times* in several editorials commenting favorably on the mission of T. T. Krisnamachari, Finance Minister of India, here a few months ago to seek a loan of $500 million from the United States. The amount required is so large that Congress will have to act on it. The answer will probably be given in the next session opening this month. Already, the Democratic Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. John F. Kennedy, aspirant to the Democratic Party nomination for President, has shown his awareness of what is involved. In an article in the *New York Times* on December 8, Kennedy wrote:

In particular, Congress must pass a loan and aid program which will prevent the failure of India's second five-year plan....

The importance of our stake in India can be judged by considering the effect on all of Asia and Africa if India should join China—with a population of nearly a billion between them—in the communist camp.

We cannot predict which way Congress will decide. But there are implications in this race between "democratic" India and "totalitarian" China which we find fascinating. We are intensely interested in India's effort to industrialize, to develop her economy so she can take her rightful place among the advanced nations—and we hope it can be done with a minimum of regimentation.

But one question keeps asserting itself: *What if it can't be done the Indian way?* Suppose the Chinese way, with what Mr. Dey calls its "curtailment of liberty," works, and the Indian way with the use of "only persuasion not coercion," does not work. What then?

What if the Indian masses then decide that they are more in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terested in being fed than in freedom—the freedom to starve, to go naked, to remain illiterate? What if the Indian masses, their country having lost the race, decide that they, too, will suffer the "curtailment of liberty" in exchange for enough food, decent clothing, adequate shelter, and education? Would they be wrong?

It was Finance Minister Krishnamachari who was responsible for our brooding over this question. For at a reception given him by the Foreign Policy Association, he said (*New York Times,* October 8, 1957):

> Freedom has little meaning to millions of people in my country who hardly get a dollar a week to spend, who are constantly faced with hunger, disease, illiteracy, and worse.

(December 13, 1957)

Why Pay More Later?

Prepublication savings still available on

A New Birth of Freedom?
by Konni Zilliacus

Price on publication in February, $5
Prepublication price, $3
Save $2 by ordering now!

The South African Treason Trial
by Lionel Forman and E. S. Sachs

Price on publication in February, $5
Prepublication price, $3
Save $2 by ordering now!

Socialists Around the World
by Helen and Scott Nearing

Price on January 27, publication day, $3
Prepublication price, $2
Save $1 by ordering now!

Send order, with check enclosed, to
MR PRESS
66 Barrow Street, New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STRANGE POWERS OF THE SENATE

BY GEORGE BRAND

The Senate of the United States has remarkable powers, not the least of which is the ability to overrule the clear mandate of national elections. It is also a fascinating place and it has a special attraction for anyone with a taste for politics as practiced by the greatest experts.

The special qualities of the Senate come out clearly in William S. White's book, *Citadel* (Harper & Bros., New York, 1957, $3.75). More important, White's account of the Senate—the Institution as he likes to call it—leads toward an understanding of the realities of American politics. That understanding is the necessary first step toward political change.

The Senate took shape, along with the House of Representatives, the presidency, and the courts, in the first days of the American republic, with only approximate directions from the Constitutional Convention. But one thing was clear from the start: the Senate was to represent people with land or money. Senators were not even elected directly by the voters, but were chosen by state legislatures, until 1914. To some extent Senate practice has changed as it went along. But the most important thing about Senate practice, as White points out repeatedly and he is certainly right, is that it has changed surprisingly little, and most Senators have shown a profound distaste for change.

The political essence of a body organized to prevent change is conservatism. It can freely be said that the Senate is the cornerstone of conservatism in American politics. White says this more in praise than not. A leftist can say it as criticism. It can also be said that the Senate's conservatism may sometimes hold up the progress of a fascist, and that even the filibuster—the device used by southern Senators to talk civil rights bills to death—has been a strong weapon in the hands of fighting liberals like the elder Senator Robert La-Follette. In any case, what is important is the effect of the workings of the Senate on American politics.

It is a commonplace of American politics that most corporations, and most newspapers which speak for business interests, favor the

---

George Brand is the pen name of a writer who was for many years a Washington correspondent covering Congress.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republican party, and that the Democratic party, since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt, is generally looked upon as standing for liberal and reform programs. For a quarter of a century now the Democrats have controlled Congress most of the time, and they lost the presidency only to the most popular man of his generation, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Yet in the face of this apparent national advantage, the Democrats have repeatedly adopted programs which failed utterly of passage in Congresses they presumably controlled. It seems clear that the Democratic party nationally cannot go on indefinitely winning congressional elections on the basis of programs which it then fails to carry out.

What is happening to the Democratic party is peculiarly a victory for the Senate, and the way in which it works. The Senate begins by shaping its individual members, and ends by controlling national organizations.

The original pattern for a Senator—someone not to be swayed by the passions of an electorate—has kept remarkably well through the years. Senators are generally reasonably conservative by the time they arrive in the upper house of Congress. They have passed through statewide political organizations to get on the ballot at all. They have had to start with, or raise, all the money needed for statewide campaigns. And they have been in politics long enough to understand keenly the important vested interests in their states and to appreciate how the interests operate politically. It is far easier for an occasional radical to win election to the House of Representatives in a single congressional district. But, occasionally, a maverick does wander into the Senate. And then the first line of defense of conservatism comes into play. On the surface, the first defense seems to work through personal relations.

The Senate has just 96 members, two from each of the United States, and has been called an exclusive club. White repeats this observation and then adds one which is newer and more important: within the club, functions an inner club. The inner club has no stated membership list, no rule book, no program, and it cuts across party lines. It amounts to a loose, fraternal grouping, an informal council of elders. It does not meet as a body. It does business by conversations in passing, by glances and expressions, by moods conveyed and shared. Entrance to the inner club cannot be gained except by acceptance of the inner membership; neither time nor tests of strength nor deeds will serve. The result is that some very senior Senators with distinguished records—like former Senator Herbert H. Lehman of New York—never become inner club men. Why not? Since there is no rule book, there cannot be an easy answer. Probably Lehman was too firmly liberal. And could it have had anything to do

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with his being a Jew? Lehman was a borderline case. In the case of Glen Taylor of Idaho, not mentioned by White, the possibility of inner club membership did not arise. The elders treated the man who came from the tent shows of the Rocky Mountain states and had the temerity to run with Henry Wallace on the Progressive Party ticket in 1948 as if he literally did not exist. They passed him in the aisles of the Senate chamber without seeing him.

The personal pressures are real and powerful. Hubert Humphrey breathed fire and brimstone in the Democratic Convention of 1948. No one could have stood more uncompromisingly for complete civil rights for Negroes. By the time the Minnesotan had tasted the ancient splendors of the Senate for only a little while, he began to change. The possibility of inner membership, without words, dangled before him. Humphrey did in fact achieve the inner circle, according to White, and it is a fact that the civil rights compromises which have robbed the Democratic party of its strength were engineered in agreement between Humphrey and the wily Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, Texas Democrat.

But social pressure alone, while deceptively powerful, could never serve to hold in line a group of highly individualistic politicians, at the height of their careers, able men generally, holding office for six years. The ultimate instrument of control is the Senate's system of committees.

A Senator can make himself a force nationally, sometimes, simply by using the Senate floor as a forum and speaking. He may also distinguish himself by parliamentary maneuver. But largely the business of the Senate is to pass, or to refuse to pass, bills—laws in the making. The bills, when introduced in the Senate, must be parcelled out among the Senate's committees before reaching the floor for action. It is a Washington commonplace that the crucial work of the Senate is performed in committee. The committees, and in most cases really their chairman or most senior members, determine the shape of a bill or whether in fact the body can vote on it at all. The times when the Senate might overrule a committee and force action on a bill buried in committee are rare.

Formal mechanism for organization of the committees by the two parties does exist. But basically it is the inner club which runs the committees. And the outsider can be shunted off from the chief activities of the Senate as if he were not there.

Both the inner club and the senior layers of the committee, to a remarkable extent, speak with a southern accent. The social graces, the personal style, the oratorical skills, are essentially southern. Partly this is a tribute to the unquestioned parliamentary skill of many life-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long southern politicians. But in much greater part, the southerners are so influential in the Senate for a combination of three reasons which get to the kernel of Senate power:

1. The Senate is a body in which sectionalism counts for more than national politics. The smallest states have the same two senators as the largest states. By tradition and the structure of the chamber itself, Senators think of themselves in the first instance as guardians of the interests—monied interests more often than not—of their state and region. The southern senators in particular in any showdown of national politics speak for the south, not for the Democratic party or any other national political organization.

2. As a traditionally and structurally conservative body, in which terms of service are staggered so that only a third of the seats come up for contest every two years, the Senate runs its committees on the basis of seniority. The members who have sat on a committee longest run it. The committee member who heads the seniority list on the majority party side almost always holds the all-powerful chairmanship—unless the inner club has seen fit to shift his committee membership and break the uninterrupted flow of his committee seniority.

3. The southerners dominate the seniority lists. Because most of them are re-elected term after term, without opposition, by a small percentage of the potential electorate in their states, they generally can stay in the Senate as long as they live. Southern elections, of course, are based on as few votes as possible for Negroes, and relatively few for poor whites. Thus an essentially conservative, or reactionary body, the Senate, is dominated by the politics of the most conservative, or reactionary, section of the country.

Some leftists have tried to explain what goes on in the Senate by crudely assigning one or another specific banking or big business interest to each Senator. It does not work that way. It does not have to. To be sure, an unknown but certainly large number of Senators in a campaign year will quietly receive and use contributions from, say, the power or oil or natural gas propagandists. But while some of the Senators need campaign money, they do not need to be bribed, and the difference is significant.

Herbert Lehman of New York was himself from an international banking family, though for the most part the banking connections could hardly be seen in his voting record. If Walter George of Georgia, on the other hand, voted essentially like a representative of the House of Morgan, it was not a matter of special influence and pressure, but rather that George himself looked out at the world for the most part as a Morgan man would have. Without having to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

think about it, he held to a deeply conservative view of domestic affairs, "soundness" on fiscal policy without the budget-balancing fetish of a smalltown banker, and internationalism in foreign policy based on cooperation with British interests.

Conservatism in the Senate is generally not arranged by bribery, but is built in by structure and tradition—and these in truth are more powerful forces which reach farther. The lobbyist who works busily in Washington corridors and offices trying to influence legislation can often influence a Senator friendly to his interests—by giving him material, ideas, and even money—but he can rarely turn a vote, except insofar as he may sometimes set off a truly national wave of political feeling.

The way the Senate works helps account for the influence it has on national politics. If its conservatism were less deep-seated, it might more easily be swayed by the national political organizations. As it is, the Senate ignores the national bodies, when it wishes, with bland contempt. The specific effect of this in recent years has been the crippling of the Democratic party in particular.

The conventions held by the major parties every four years serve to nominate presidential candidates, but they are also the only truly national meetings at which political programs can be worked out. Between conventions, the national committees function. For more than ten years now, the Democratic party at each national meeting has adopted a program which included proposals to extend civil rights and other liberal reform and welfare measures. And year after year, the Democratic party in the Senate has blocked the national Democratic program, obviously on civil rights, but on other measures too.

Note that it is the Democratic party in the Senate, not merely its southern wing. More than ten years ago, when just a few Democratic votes were needed to uphold the presidential veto of the Taft-Hartley law, labor lobbyists were amazed to find that a few, relatively liberal, Democratic senators somehow could not be reached, although most of the liberals had of course voted for labor. The inconclusive civil rights fight in 1957 saw a similar situation. The bill which finally did pass may or may not have importance, in the long run, for reasons far beyond the province of the Senate. However, within the Senate itself, it was the jury trial amendment, curbing authority over southern officials who balk at letting Negroes vote, which chiefly limited the bill. In the crucial vote on the jury trial amendment, the southern Democrats of course voted "Aye" for the proviso. But of 24 northern Democrats, 15 also voted for the amendment and only 9 voted "No." The inner club members among the northern Democrats, with only one or two exceptions, were among the 15 voting

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the south for the jury trial amendment.

It can be argued that the northern Democratic Senators have to live with their southern cousins and are subject to all the leverages of inner club and committee politics. But what about the Democratic party as a national organization? Why does it hold still for constant betrayal of avowed Democratic programs?

In part the betrayal is only apparent. White acutely points out that the southern bloc is a convenience for many northern reactionaries, Democratic and Republican alike. They do not really want civil rights or other liberal measures. The southern bloc allows these northerners to vote right, according to their states' mandates, in safety because they know the bills will not pass.

But of course many northern Democrats, including among others the voters, do want the things they vote for. What moves them to hold onto the strangling southern alliance? The answer here lies in presidential politics.

An ancient hackney of political writing is the phrase "the solid south." The illusion persists that if the south is treated moderately by the northern Democrats, the Democratic candidate for President every four years will be awarded a tidy bloc of 128 electoral votes from the 11 states of the deep south. That represents a handsome start toward election, since only 266 electoral votes are needed.

It is curious that this illusion has managed to persist so long in the face of the plain results of presidential elections going back to the 1920's. Since the Republican victory with Herbert Hoover in 1928, the south has withheld part of its electoral vote from the Democratic ticket in every election except when Franklin D. Roosevelt was running—and he did not need the south. No less than five southern states combined to give Hoover 61 electoral votes, and for no better reason than that his opponent, Al Smith, was a Catholic. The Dixiecrats in 1948 did not vote for Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican, but they withheld 39 electoral votes from Harry S. Truman and might have thrown the outcome into the House of Representatives. And of course Dwight D. Eisenhower, who had been the secret hope of many Democrats in 1948, including labor leaders, captured substantial blocs of southern electoral votes both in 1952 and 1956.

In other words, the south is not solidly Democratic, except on terms which could not be acceptable to any body of northern Democratic voters. But can the northern Democrats win without the south? The answer is twofold: the record says they can, and in any case it is the only way they can put over their program at all.

The clearest measure of how the northern Democrats can make out is seen in the history of congressional elections which come every

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two years and reflect local political feelings. Needless to say, the Democrats did best in the various northern regions in the seven congressional elections between 1932 and 1944 during the Roosevelt period. New England alone among the northern regions failed to give the Democrats a majority of its congressional vote in any of the seven congressional elections, but it did give the Democratic congressional candidates as a whole from 45% to 49% of its total vote. The East Central and West Central states both cast a majority of their vote for Democratic candidates in three of the seven Roosevelt period congressional elections. The Pacific states voted Democratic in four out of seven congressional elections. The Middle Atlantic states went Democratic, congressionally, five out of seven times, while the Mountain states went Democratic every one of the seven times.

In short, depending on the times, the programs and the candidates, the northern Democrats can carry the country without compromising with the south, whereas compromising with the south has done them no good at all.

And this brings the political trail back to the Senate, where a Gordian knot waits to be cut—if the liberal northern Democrats care to do so. No third party offered to left of center voters in recent years has succeeded in stirring up much interest, though it makes no sense on that account to rule all third party ideas off the course, as some have done. But reform of the Democratic party remains very much a live issue. If the record of the Senate casts any light, what is needed for a start is to regard the northern Democrats as a separate body, and to sever cleanly the tie to any Democrats—meaning the southerners—who do not act on their party's most basic program, reaffirmed, time and time again, in national conventions and in elections.

Left as a rump organization, the southerners in the Senate could be detached from their seniority and thereby from their dominance of the committees. One bold and powerful stroke might break the ice jam in American politics and open the way for change—among other places, in the south itself. Northern liberals could campaign on their own program: what they won they could carry out, without fear of blockade in the Senate, provided the southern Senators could no longer combine their own seniority with northern voting majorities to take a stranglehold on the key Senate committees. And in the south itself, the way might be open for genuine two-party fights, for the first time in modern history.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POLAND A YEAR AFTER

BY PAUL M. SWEEZY

Warsaw, November 17

Just over a year has passed since Poland's October Revolution, and the country is so obviously still in a transitional stage that it is extremely difficult to acquire a coherent view of the present situation. And yet it is important to try, for it is clear that what is now happening here can have a crucial effect on the future of socialism everywhere.

First, it cannot be overemphasized that Poland is in important respects one of the freest countries in the world. Not only can people say just what they please, but most of them do, loudly and whenever the spirit moves them. Moreover, opinion, at least in the cities, is strongly critical of the regime. If anyone a few years ago had suggested that such a situation could exist in a Communist society—and Poland remains a Communist country—he would have been a fit subject for an insane asylum. But the situation exists all the same, and nothing is less uncertain here in Poland than that it will continue to exist for the foreseeable future.

The big questions, it seems to me, are whether this unique mixture of Communism and freedom is viable, and whether it is exportable. I can't hope to give answers, but I can perhaps set down some of the relevant considerations. I should add that I do so on the basis of several days of friendly and frank talks with a half dozen or so of the most intelligent and objective men I have met in a long time, most of them occupying high positions in the government or party. Poland today stimulates both intelligence and objectivity.

Economically, Poland is not in good shape but neither is she in very bad shape. During the past year definite progress has been made in some lines, while many serious problems remain to be tackled, let alone solved. Overall, the statistics look quite favorable. Total production is up about 10 percent, money wages 25 percent, and real wages just under 20 percent. The relative increase of consumption indicated by these figures has, of course, been balanced by a decline in investment—from about 30 percent to 20 percent of national income.

These global figures, however, conceal many disparities and disharmonies. Wage increases have been disproportionately distributed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so that some groups like the miners and those at the bottom of the scale have benefited substantially while others, particularly intellectual workers, are actually worse off today than they were a year ago. Supplies of raw materials are often deficient, which in turn is related to a very difficult balance of payments situation. Inflationary pressures are strong, and the price system contains many irrationalities which lead to such phenomena as queuing, black-marketing, speculation, and so on. On the other hand, the situation in agriculture is remarkably favorable. Since the abandonment of attempts at forced collectivization, and the granting of greater economic freedom to the peasantry, all idle land has been brought under cultivation and production has markedly increased. In addition, the countryside has been experiencing an investment boom in buildings and equipment so that a continuation of the upward trend in agricultural output is in prospect.

Let me digress for a moment here to say that the ideal of collectivized agriculture has not been abandoned, but all but a few diehards are now convinced that henceforth the creation of collective farms will have to be the voluntary act of the peasants themselves. In this connection, I heard some encouraging reports of the development of Danish-type cooperatives and of organized activity on the part of peasants in the fields of local self-government, demonstration of new techniques, and the like. But there should be no illusions about rapid changes or early solutions. The best Poland can hope to do in the foreseeable future is to turn ignorant and backward peasants into efficient and educated farmers. What may be possible after that no one is yet in a position to say.

To sum up: currently the economic picture is decidedly mixed. The standard of living remains low, life is hard. The economy is still full of disproportionalities and anomalies. But progress is being made in both respects, and agriculture is in relatively good condition. For the longer run, the economic prospect can be described as good to excellent. The country is well endowed with natural resources—especially those necessary for the creation of a modern chemical industry—and there are no inherent obstacles to a steady rise in output and living standards. The Poles are doing good work in a relatively new field called "perspective" planning, which looks years ahead and attempts to anticipate in a timely way the needs and problems of the future. Those responsible for drawing up the perspective plan consider that it is entirely possible and practicable for Poland to achieve by 1975 an average standard of living equal to that of West Germany today, *but very much more equally distributed*. Considering that West Germany is one of the world's most advanced countries and that Poland has but recently broken out of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the vicious circle of backwardness and poverty, this would be no mean achievement.

Let me digress again at this point to say a word about planning and planners in Poland. There is no doubt that Poland is in the front rank in this field. And I think it is no accident that the leading economists, particularly Kalecki and Lange, are men who have spent years in the West where they are universally respected among economists for their contributions to economic and econometric theory. Some of us have long maintained that latter-day developments in bourgeois economics can have great value for socialist planning, and the experience of Poland is proving the point very convincingly. Under the direction of Lange and Kalecki and others, a new generation of economists is being trained in Poland in far more favorable conditions than have hitherto existed in any socialist country. It is not fanciful to suggest that, just as Britain was the home of classical bourgeois economics, so Poland may be the home of classical socialist economics.

The political situation in Poland is generally gloomier than the economic. The October events were the beginning of a genuine political revolution, but unfortunately it was interrupted mid-way by the Hungarian disaster and has never since resumed its course. The result is that the thorough political housecleaning which should have and could have taken place last fall and winter is still in abeyance and becomes increasingly difficult to carry out with every month that passes. The party machine of the Stalinist period is still in business, and, being thoroughly unpopular, it naturally compromises the Gomulka leadership. Gomulka, for his part, has projected a purge of the party membership to get rid of both "conservatives" (i.e., Stalinists) and "revisionists" (a diverse group but certainly containing many empty-headed utopians); and every one I talked to agreed that such a purge would be a necessary, though not a sufficient, condition for successful new recruiting and rebuilding the party's strength and prestige. However, I met no one optimistic enough to predict that the purge would be successfully carried through, let alone that the party would soon be on the road back to health. Gomulka himself is universally respected, but neither he nor any one else can soon repair the ravages of the odious form of Stalinism that flourished in Poland in the years after 1948.

The political situation is of course closely connected with the mood and temper of the people. With the important exception of the peasantry, which seems to be well satisfied, the Polish people are hypercritical, disgruntled, and generally uncooperative. This does not mean that they are against socialism in general and in favor of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a restoration of capitalism. No doubt these attitudes can be found, but I would judge that they are not typical. For the most part, Poles are not thinking in terms of social systems but of living standards. They are fed up with what they have and irritably impatient for much bigger improvements than any conceivable system could provide in the near future. This is a mood which makes for demoralization and anarchy. Theft of state property is widespread and generally condoned if not approved. All sorts of ingenious rackets flourish. The people are so touchy that the government does not dare to take simple measures which every one agrees are necessary if the economy is to be put back in order. The best example, one of many, concerns the price of urban transport which is so low (about 2½ cents per ride in Warsaw, and much cheaper for monthly tickets) that no one walks even for a few blocks and the trolleys and buses are intolerably overcrowded. Every one gripes about the crowding, but the government is convinced that to raise the fare to a level that would more nearly equalize supply and demand would provoke an even more ugly display of the public's temper.

In one sense, this mood of the Polish people seems hard to understand. There is no doubt that the average standard of living today is considerably higher than it was under the old prewar regime, and one might think that the reaction should be positive rather than negative. But such a calculation neglects what has happened in the meantime. During the Stalinist period, the Poles were told so many fantastic lies about how good things were and how much better they were getting that they finally stopped believing anything. And the reality was so much worse than the official version that they even convinced themselves that they were worse off than they used to be. Psychologically and politically, the very real gains of the last ten years were thus turned into losses. The chickens finally came home to roost, and with a vengeance. Such are, and always will be, the results of a policy of deliberately deceiving the people.

Popular disillusionment is deep-rooted and manifests itself in many, often surprising, ways. For example, I was told that the most important word in the Polish language today is *lipa,* which means a kind of ersatz tea that was made from linden leaves during the war and may be loosely translated as bunk or baloney. If any one were to speak in public of idealism or sacrifice, he would be silenced with derisive cries of "lipa." Young people have turned completely away from politics; the socialist youth organization at the University of Warsaw has no more than a couple of dozen or so members. One party member, commenting on this situation, said ruefully that at any rate one could now know that anyone politically active in the socialist youth movement really believes in socialism because his work

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would bring only jeers and hard knocks and would in no way further his career. For a moment, I thought I must have been magically transported to the United States!

A counterpart to disillusionment with things at home is a tendency to an uncritical idealization of everything coming from the West. In the early months after October, almost anything Western—literature, movies, painting—was enthusiastically taken up quite regardless of quality. And conversely, everything Soviet was derided as inferior. More recently, to be sure, there has been some recovery of a sense of balance—a result to which the sputniks have, needless to say, made an important contribution—but still the Polish picture of the outside world is far from objective. In particular, almost everyone, including many social scientists, believes that American capitalism has entered a new and more benevolent phase: its dependence on arms spending is either wholly ignored or, in the manner of our own liberals, written off as temporary and accidental. The desire to believe good of the West is vast and the extent to which the desire has been realized is only a little less impressive.

That all of this adds up to a paradoxical, unhealthy, and inherently unstable situation goes without saying. One Polish economist said to me, only half facetiously, that if one could only be sure that the process could be reversed the best thing for Poland would be a return to capitalism for a few years. The people would be reminded of what it used to be like with glaring inequalities, exploitation, and unemployment. The worst irrationalities of the present price structure would be eliminated by the "impersonal forces of the market." And the Polish working class and Polish youth might recover their revolutionary ardor for a more equal, just, and humane society.

In practice, future developments in Poland are likely to pursue a rather more prosaic course. There is no immediate or prospective crisis in Polish affairs, and the country's international position is unlikely to be seriously altered. However much Poles may dislike Russians, most of them dislike Germans even more and support the Soviet alliance as the essential guarantee of national survival. The example of Hungary has effectively silenced the remainder. There is no real alternative to the present regime and its policy of alignment with the USSR, and in their hearts the Poles know it, as last winter's election conclusively proved. On the other hand, there is nothing in the present situation to indicate the likelihood of an early or drastic change in the attitudes of the Polish people. One would normally assume that a situation as messy as that which now exists in Poland must be short lived. But apparently this is not so: I know of no reason why it shouldn't last indefinitely.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the long run, to be sure, grounds for greater optimism are not lacking. If Polish planners are right about the long-range prospects for living standards, and if the regime promises no more than is actually forthcoming, the temper of the people should gradually improve. If and when that happens, Poland will have a chance to develop into a genuine socialist democracy.

MAXIMS MORAL AND POLITICAL

BY BARROWS DUNHAM

These are exercises in an old literary form, long disused but consecrated by La Bruyère, La Rochefoucauld, Vauvenargues, and Chamfort to the distillation of philosophy. Some of Marx's *Theses on Feuerbach* undoubtedly belong to this tradition. A thought stands naked when expressed in a few words, and has only its native truth and beauty to survive upon. The maxim, or epigram, is thus the severest test of its own content. It needs to be clear, brief, and dialectical (since its inner movement generally derives from a collocation of opposites).

If we had more faith in ourselves, we would be less despairing of others.

Inquisitors make public many things, but never their own motives.

No man is too villainous to hold public office.

Power seldom corrupts the powerless.

It is better to be appreciated than praised, but few people would prefer it.

Hacks repeat one another; an artist expresses himself.

Barrows Dunham is the author of Man Against Myth, Giant In Chains, *and other notable works in the field of philosophy.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If artists had ever had the immodesty of critics, there would be no masterpieces.

A renegade barters ideals he never held for safety he will never have.

High places would be open to talent, if it were not for those who already occupy them.

Ghostwriters are people who write for ghosts.

The positivists say that we can know facts but not values, that we can know the atom but not the use we ought to put it to. This is the philosophy of every suicide, who understands the mechanisms of destruction but not the value of life.

The death of an evil man rejoices us, not because it was a man who died, but because a source of evil died with him.

It is the part of wisdom to love well, and of loving well to love wisely.

The stupid imagine fools to be wise, and fools imagine the wise to be stupid.

The love of knowledge is much praised, and the fear of it is much practiced.

If the hours of labor which men have spent in establishing or escaping servitude had been used for the common good, we should now be living in perhaps the thirty-fifth century.

LINK OF MADNESS TO GENIUS STUDIED

ANALYST CITES CASE OF NOBEL SCIENTIST
AS EXAMPLE OF POSSIBLE CONNECTION

. . . The scientist, Dr. Giovacchini related, continued his work alone. His symptoms indicated feelings of estrangement, as if his mind and body were separated. He also showed anxiety toward and preoccupation with world affairs and thought constantly about the future of civilization and about war and destruction.

—*New York Times, December* 8, 1957

That clinches it—he's mad all right.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WORLD OF SCIENCE

by Philip Morrison

THE SPUTNIKI

Sputnik z'eml'i—fellow-traveler of the earth: there is a new meaning to the words, a new sense transcending the wry political overtones of the anglicized phrase. Twice now, probably from the low steppe east of Stalingrad and the great Volga bend, Soviet rocketeers have launched an artifact into the very heavens. The date of October 4th, 1957, and then of November 3rd, will remain in history.

Look away for a while from the rush of political and strategic comment to the meaning of this event. It is impossible for anyone who has a sense of community with the rise of the modern world of ideas, and its base in science, not to feel a warm glow. For *sputnik* and its successors are nothing less than the final concrete refutation of the physics of Aristotle, and of its medieval followers. Aristotle's concept was by no means absurd; indeed, with real insight it gave order to the experiences of its time. It made the claim that the universe contained two classes of objects: one, lying always remote, beyond the sphere of the moon, was celestial in its nature, incorruptible, shining, capable of moving about the heavens perpetually without falling to the central earth. The second class of matter was of the earth, earthy. It was not shining, but dull, not incorruptible, but prey to rust and decay, not capable of the swinging arcs of the heavenly bodies, but bound forever to the grasp of the earth, from which it could escape for a mere few seconds, unless fire seized it or the winds supported it. Now, this is the beginning of science. For certainly the motions of the planets and of the stars differ precisely in this way from the motions of arrow or stone, of spray or of bird.

But science has put this beginning behind it. It was Galileo who first showed the materiality of the heavens, when his telescope made clear the rocky crags of the moon's disc, and the black shifting spots marring the face of the sun himself. The laws of motion were searched out, and finally Newton set physics on its present path when he showed that apple and moon moved under the same laws. The world has in fact a material unity, and the different quality of the motions of planet and cannonball arises from the quantity of momentum each contains. Dynamic order lies in the world at hand no less

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than in the cyclical world of the heavens, but it is an order far more complex, an order hard to search out.

So we believed, and so have the engineers wrought, ever since the Renaissance. But it had to be admitted that no artifact, nothing which bore the marks of man's hand or of his subtle tools, had ever really shared the celestial motion. Only in the framework of detailed quantitative measurement of the astronomer was this view demonstrated. It led to the precise prediction of the motion of the old planets, and a century ago to the discovery of an unseen one, Neptune, signalled by irregularities of the motion of Uranus. Such a prediction was marvelous, but it was passive, remote, numerical. Now this has changed. Glinting like the planets in the twilight and the dawn, there are new morning and evening stars. They orbit with almost perfect regularity. But they are fashioned of earthy aluminum, they bear the clear signs of the sure insight and difficult choices of their human designers, they are spotted with the grease of the shop and the sweat of the machinist's hands. In one of these circuiting planets, there sat quietly a patient laboratory dog. Men had promoted mere earthy stuff to heavenly luminosity, mobility, regularity, even permanence. The mysterious essence of celestial matter is but its quantity of motion.

The satellites became orbital with a good hard push, nothing more. Everyone knows that neither wings nor jet nor fuel are needed to maintain that wonderful schedule which puts *sputnik* over Europe, say, on the hour and over Brazil ten minutes after. Here is the simple exhibition of the first law of motion: it is natural to keep moving .There is nothing to stop the satellite, or almost nothing, so it moves. As it moves it falls, but it never touches the earth. The earth's pull bends its orbit constantly away from the straight line, bending it finally into a near-circle, actually an ellipse whose center lies very near the center of the earth. Around and around the ellipse the object flies, tumbling slowly as it goes. The ceaseless tumbling, begun by the slight residual imbalances in the great push with which the satellite is launched, is made manifest by the minute-by-minute changes in its brightness in the sky as it passes, and even shows up as a regular fading and return of its radio voice.

The first satellite was a simple test object, thrown out to see if the elaborate rocket system worked, and fitted only with a pair of small radio transmitters, whose main, and perhaps only function, was to send out the famous *beeps*. With these signals the satellite could be tracked by radiomen everywhere, by professionals with their great antennas, or by amateurs with a small table set. I heard its signal that first day with real excitement, for the quick rise in volume as the little ball passed over the horizon into radio hearing distance,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the crescendo as it neared overhead, and the swift decline were easy to hear and interpret. A couple of ingenious students here in my department, using their physics, a map, and a simple radio, found the orbit in a few days, with accuracy adequate for predictions good to a couple of minutes, and could plot for us just where the ball passed each time it came near the United States, and about how high it was.

By now the professionals have learned a great deal from *sputnik*. Most of all, they have used its very flight as a means to check their ideas about the residual resistance of the air up there, "air" which is as rare as the vacuum in a good TV tube, and is modified in its atomic state by the unshielded glare of the sun and the influx of solar particles. For this sort of measurement, a nearly passive "bird" will do; all one wants is to know where it is. For three weeks its batteries powered the radio beeps; now, they are dead, and only an occasional sighting may help the big radar antenna dishes to fix its motion.

Sputnik II is a different breed of bird. In the first shot, a two-foot sphere was projected weakly forward from the last rocket of the series. But the rocket case itself flew around with very nearly the same speed. A thin aluminum shell some thirty or forty feet long, and maybe three or four feet in diameter, this case gleamed as brightly as Venus. The second *sputnik* itself is just such a long rocket tube, now holding a compact flying laboratory. The instruments, weighing a good part of the half-ton total, were measuring solar and cosmic radiation, and transmitting informative pulses to the ground, where by quite standard means the pulses are used to "read" the remote instruments. Most imaginative and demanding of the launched equipment was the little capsule which houses a dog, supplying it with air, heat, food, water, and removing its wastes. This first weightless traveler acts as instrument, whose "reading" of heart rate, respiration, blood pressure, and the rest are also signalled to the waiting receivers. His life will help judge how great are the meteoritic and radiation hazards space holds for men.

Before too long, it may be expected that half-a-dozen such flying laboratories will incessantly roam the skies; some long-lived, some short. Both US and USSR satellites will be there before a year or two has gone by, and some at least will be arranged for perpetual flight, in the nearly-empty space beyond three or four hundred miles up. Sputnik II will probably outlast Sputnik I, unless its launchers have arranged to cause it to come down to recover some of its contents. But neither stays sufficiently high around the whole orbit so that the effect of the air is beyond perception. That will come soon. The almanacs of the near future will need a section on artificial moons, quasi-permanent additions to the solar system.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How big a push is needed to convert inert metal into a moon? It is easy to compute that the energy stored in the necessary motion of such a moon could be about enough to heat it to the temperature of the solar surface. To place all that into such a moon smoothly and efficiently, without melting the little sphere, only one scheme is known. That is the rocket, in which a jet of gas shoots backward, its recoil pushing the casing steadily ahead. A rocket pushes only on itself; it neither breathes nor pushes the air. A great deal of energy is spent in sending back the jet gases, and only a small part of it is stored in the "payload," as the jargon has it. Greatest efficiency is attained by doing the job step-wise: first spending one rocket load of fuel, dropping off the spent casing, starting another rocket, and repeating. The fourth stage is probably the satellite itself. For every unit of energy stored in the motion of the satellite, at least a hundred or two hundred units are lost in the energy of rocket flame and spent casing. The atmospheric resistance eats a good deal, too, in the first slow gain of twenty miles altitude. The initial rocket stage is a great metal cylinder, jammed with pumps, piping, and tanks of bizarre fuel, perhaps liquid oxygen and kerosene, or even more unusual substances. It weighs above a hundred tons, and emits a jet of hot streaming gas so powerful that the whole thing rises at first ponderously, then faster and faster, with a thrust equal to that of a big multi-unit freight diesel locomotive.

This great power is under quite delicate control. The times of cutting off one stage for the next, the angles with which stage after stage is projected, the speed of the jet gases and their direction must all be well controlled. The *sputniki* have orbits so near the most desirable shapes that we can be sure that the Soviet rocketeers can control the timing to better than a second, and the directions to a matter of a couple of degrees.

Such guidance implies a cargo of delicate gyroscopic instruments, which constantly define the exact directions in space, and a system of amplifying devices which make these judgments known, probably both to other parts of the rocket, adjusting the jets to suit, and to the ground. There automatic rapid computation can be carried on, and signals with the results sent up by radio to modify the settings as needed.

All this is the culmination of years of effort, by development and research people in a variety of sciences, from metallurgy to electronics to mathematics to chemistry, by a skilled coordinated corps of designers, by production people and workmen of a hundred trades, by draftsmen, computers, technicians, stock-keepers, and finally by the skilled personnel who man the test site itself. A great roar and a flash, and the first stage fires, rising slowly into the sky. In the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

next few minutes, the various stages receive their guidance, fire, and are spent. Radar and radio locate the flying object, and the orbit can already be surmised. But the real test comes an hour or two later, when, if all has gone well, the circumnavigating object comes again within radio range of the test site, now a few hundred miles to the west, moving with the sun as the earth turns.

The paradox of our era is very clear to-day: for the *sputniki* not only cap the physics of our time, but they bear the lineaments of Mars. An intercontinental ballistic missile is not much different from a satellite. It probably has to have a somewhat heavier mass even than Sputnik II, perhaps a ton or two of hydrogen bomb. It needs a launching speed more than half as great. If it is to hit a distant city, its guidance needs to be rather better than that of the sputnik launchers. Moreover, it must come down into the dense atmosphere again, and speed rapidly towards the ground target. This re-entry problem—as the jargon goes—is a complex one; it is not too hard to manage a very slow re-entry (slow for a rocket) but such a slow re-entry is both a source of aiming error and an opportunity for counter-missiles. Fast re-entry is difficult, for the missile may burn up. Here is a region of great contention among the experts in this unhappy game.

In the overall view, a sputnik weighing half-a-ton is an earnest of all but final success at the intercontinental ballistic missile. The launchers of the sputniki are certainly very nearly prototypes of Soviet ICBM. Our own small satellite project was early separated from the military program, and depended on a rather modest rocket for its flight. There is no reason to doubt that the United States intercontinental ballistic missiles have designs about like the Soviet satellite launchers; ours, however, do not yet work. It seems probable that a year or two now separates the best American and the best Russian performance in this military field.

Above all, the Soviet satellites mark the end of an era in which opinion at large held the Soviet Union to be a technologically imitative, marginally second-best power, no real rival for the mighty United States of America. A sober observer cannot yet say anything else than that it is still true that the United States industrial development, for depth, breadth, quantity, and quality, is overall the greatest in the world. But the Soviet is today a very strong second; in this or that important area, it is surely first. More than that, its rate of growth is definitely the higher. Let us strike a comparison between the US and the USSR in a few fields of advance technology in 1957. Our comparison will be but a sample; perhaps it will be suggestive, though for want of completeness it may be that the impression is untrustworthy. The full task is beyond me, and in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

end must be shouldered by the historians of the future.

1. The Government of India has recently purchased a complete integrated Soviet steel mill. Before signing the contract, the Indian experts satisfied themselves by direct, personal, on-the-spot measurements that the Soviet performance claims were valid ones. They found that the best Soviet blast furnace design, for a given size of furnace, outproduced the best American designs by at least a third. (The source of this fact is private, but directly informed and reliable.)

2. The largest machine in the world for the acceleration of subatomic particles to high energy is in the great riverside laboratory where the Volga comes closest to Moscow. It is a giant member of that family whose archetype is the cyclotron, and it is ten times more massive than the prodigal Berkeley machine which is the world runner-up. So far the machine is not operating; such complex and novel devices often take years after nominal completion before they work well.

So far original Soviet contributions to this branch of science have been very little more than those of one of the great American universities, more than half-a-dozen of which are vigorously at work. The school of theoretical physicists under Professor L. D. Landau at Moscow is, however, justly famous, and compares with that surrounding the late Enrico Fermi at Rome and later at Chicago, and with that of Professor R. E. Peierls since the war at Birmingham, England. Soviet physicists entered the field late in the day, four or five years after America. But their people are young, enthusiastic, wonderfully well-trained, and they pour out of the universities in large numbers. They will bid for leadership in the years ahead.

Soviet nuclear technology in the more familiar fields is excellent, but in both the scientific side and the side of power production lags behind Britain and the United States. Britain has the most need for power, and has indeed done most with the peaceful atom in the economic world. The United States is second, and the Soviet Union third. The first power plant making electricity for peaceful use was Soviet, but it is a small plant, rather commonplace. It was far outpowered by the earlier United States submarine power plants, which make electric power to drive naval submarines. This Soviet *first,* legitimate though the claim is, is a tribute to its political-diplomatic policy, not mainly to its technologists. Meanwhile Britain, with great hopes and great skill concentrated on a few designs, has far outproduced the others in kilowatt-hours. The United States, for its part, has a multiple program, very diversified and ambitious, but with little incentive to seek practical non-military use it has mainly built prototypes and pilot plants.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In bombs, the United States leads in quantity and diversity. A good second is the Soviet Union, doubtless with nuclear explosive enough to scorch the whole world. We have enough to do it a few times over. The British are here behind in scale, but not in intensity.

3. The finest operating passenger transport plane today is the Soviet Tupolev 104, flying Prague-Peking daily in around twelve hours. A Soviet visitor remarked this summer that formerly to go from the Russian to European or American airlines was to exchange the hard seats of third-class for a first-class comfortable passage. Now, he said, the Atlantic hop appears slow, tedious, and uncomfortable beside the smooth, quiet jet. The Tu-104 is fearfully noisy on the ground, and it has been criticized as uneconomical of fuel. The plane is subsidized, but that feature is not unknown to airlines of less high-grade performance than Aeroflot's best. The new jet is fast, large, safe, and comfortable. Two hostesses are aboard, with tea and magazines; the interior is pressurized and quite literally plush.

These are three glimpses of a huge complex organism. Soviet industrial technology is overall about half the size of the American, gauged by steel or energy. This smaller size is its main limitation. It simply lacks the range and multiplicity of our own. What we do in many labs and shops all over the country, some places well, some places poorly, the Soviets can often do very well only in one. But the list above makes plain that now they can do some things better than we, and not merely in a few show places of the society, but in key activities: steel, planes, of course rockets. Much larger than the German economy, more vigorous if not so subtle as the British, Soviet industry explicitly aims at surpassing the American.

It is absurd to think that any land has a monopoly upon scientific or technical skill. A great industrial land like the Soviet with a splendid tradition of scientific achievement even in the old backward days, must be expected to take the lead in some developments, just as the Americans lead in many. Khrushchev in his Reston interview, as in his fortieth anniversary address, was far more soberly wise than most American comment since *sputnik*. He pointed out that between two great diverse far-flung operating industrial societies there could be no overall and permanent differential of quality. Sometimes one would lead in one area for half a year, he said, then the other would catch up. Step-by-step equality cannot be expected, for history is always uneven. As long as such a great technical economy continues fully at work, it can innovate to match its rivals very soon indeed. Overall, two such economies will keep qualitatively abreast, until in the long run the rate of economic growth and the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depth of the search for and mobilization of human resources will settle the issue.

Here is the question: Soviet rocketry skill is beside the real point. The mature capitalist economy, either in war goods or the arts of peace, is still today clearly in the lead over the younger, war-damaged, over-centralized socialist one. Good Soviet electronics and chemical industries are not yet a match for the multiplicity of achievements of the great American counterparts. The automobile and the refrigerator are trite but true symbols of the greater productivity of the United States.

There is an important offset. About half of the Soviet population lives on the farm. The people share relatively little in the product of Soviet industry. In America we have only twenty percent on the farm, and aside from the South, our rural population is pretty thoroughly enmeshed by the power lines and the new roads. Thus the newer Soviet technology is not so far as the global statistics would make it appear from approaching the *per capita* production of our own. Here one uses an arbitrary population figure, counting only city dwellers and those near farms; the deep-country farm population is left out. In fact they *are* left out in most ways. The single-mindedness of Soviet production, with its large savings rate, and its freedom from the burden of our over-blown automobile industry, partly makes up even this margin. So it is no wonder that the best Soviet performance can outdo ours. The illusion of the backward Soviet system is, one hopes, dead at last, and beyond revival even by photographs of the log cabins on the collective farms. A good many visitors have seen the TV antennas sticking up from some of those log cabins.

The Soviet economy, and the climate of opinion that it generates, have one major advantage, which contributes to the impressive Soviet potential even more than to present achievement. That is their educational system. It is worth close study. One can say here that it represents the most serious decisions of a rational economy. It is well-financed, for a country still not rich, with a higher claim on the national income than in the United States, with a student-teacher ratio only three-quarters as great as ours, and with state-financed mass participation. It enjoys deep, permanent popular support, no less than government favor. Opinion there is thoroughly behind science; science, and learning as a whole, do not find rivals for their secular claims to the creative spirit of man, to the hope of the future. The contrast with America today, where schools and learning are without even adequate financial support, and very much lack the social approval so manifest abroad, is all too plain. In this domain, not less than in the maintenance of full employment, lies the present's challenge to the American system of corporate enterprise.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME IMPRESSIONS OF CHINA'S ECONOMIC PROGRESS

BY SOLOMON ADLER

I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to revisit China last summer after an absence of ten years. During my two months' stay I saw a number of cities with which I had been familiar in the past and several I had never been to before. I also had long and frank discussions with Government economic experts in Peking.

It goes without saying that there have been tremendous changes since 1947. Many power stations, blast furnaces, railways, and hundreds of new factories have been built. For the first time in history the Yangtze is now spanned by a magnificent bridge at Wuhan, which was completed more than two years ahead of schedule largely as a result of a fundamental joint Sino-Soviet innovation in bridge-building and partly also as a result of the Wuhan inhabitants' voluntary labor contributions.

Technically, a factory is a factory is a factory, to paraphrase Gertrude Stein, whether in Detroit, Coventry, Stalingrad, Yokohama or Changchun. Nevertheless, it would be sheer blindness not to recognize the nature of the achievement implicit in the title Changchun *Number One* Automobile Factory, which, it should be added, is thoroughly up-to-date in its layout and equipment, and explicit in the fact that China already has a major modern iron and steel complex in Anshan and is in the process of setting up others in Wuhan and Paotow.

As for agriculture, the very face of the countryside has been transformed. In the past the typical rural scene was that of the individual peasant working his tiny plots with at most the assistance of one or two members of his family. Parcellization was almost the universal rule. Now the typical rural scene is that of production brigades or teams working together in fields which are quite large by traditional Chinese standards, and the producers' cooperative is finally putting an end to the fragmentation of the land. If cultivation is still most intensive, indeed not less intensive than before, it is now increasingly organized on the basis of a rational division of labor and a rational utilization of the soil.

Solomon Adler, formerly Treasury attaché at the American Embassy in Chungking and Nanking, is the author of The Chinese Economy *published in* 1957 *by Monthly Review Press.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another point obvious on inspection and confirmed by visits to several agricultural producers' cooperatives is that they have already made some land reclamation possible even in densely populated and cultivated areas. This has been accomplished through the elimination of now superfluous boundaries and paths, through the institution of village cemeteries—though traveling through Shantung and Hopei by train one still sees far too many individual tombs in the fields—as well as through the extension of irrigation and of water conservancy works.

The abundance of labor is unmistakable and makes nonsense of all the malicious propaganda about the People's Government mobilizing huge armies of forced labor. For China, of all countries, to resort to large-scale forced labor camps would be sheer folly if not madness.

It is this abundance of labor which, among other things, made possible the collectivization of agriculture *without* its mechanization. Since collectivization there has been a substantial increase in the average number of work-days per year in the countryside. But even now the national average for members of agricultural producer cooperatives is only 200 work-days per year, and under the revised Draft Twelve-Year Programme for Agriculture the goal for 1967 is 250 work-days per year for men and 80-180 work-days for women. In other words, rural *under*employment is still a mass phenomenon, and much Chinese planning in agriculture is predicated on its gradual and systematic reduction.

While the collectivization of agriculture has entailed a rapid growth in the demand for technical personnel and for producer cooperative leaders with at least rudimentary training in farm management and in bookkeeping, the problem in industry is incomparably more complicated. Here the supply of particular skills in sufficient amounts is of overriding importance, and the general abundance of labor means little in the face of acute shortages of specific skills and bottlenecks.

In this connection, what is noticeable in the factories is the presence of substantial numbers of workers who are being trained for new plants which are in the same line and which are already in the course of construction. Thus, Anshan is training the highly skilled iron and steel workers needed for Wuhan and Paotow; the Changchun Number One Automobile Factory is training many workers for the Number Two and Number Three Automobile Factory; and Shanghai, China's greatest reservoir of skilled labor, has trained tens of thousands of workers in heavy and light industry in addition to exporting a significant number of engineers and technicians and a much larger number of skilled workers to the new plants that have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gone up or are going up in the interior.

As one should expect in the process of planned industrialization, the factory is a university, technical school, and vocational school as well as a concern directly engaged in production. For this reason alone there should be no marked dropping off in the rate of increase in per capita labor productivity in the course of the Second Five Year Plan. The preliminary *Proposals for the Second Five Year Plan* (1958-1962) call for an increase of 50 percent in labor productivity in industrial and building departments, as against the planned increase of 64 percent in State-owned industrial enterprises for 1953-1957 and the actual increase of 70 percent in 1953-1956. There are, therefore, good grounds for holding that this particular target may well be exceeded, especially as an additional vital factor to be taken into account is that many plants still in the course of construction at the end of the First Five Year Plan will be coming into operation during the course of the Second.

In transport the abundance of labor and the scarcity of capital-goods manifest themselves in enormous variations in labor-intensity. Even in the environs of the most modern factories there is a regular sequence first of freight trains, then of four-ton trucks, including some manufactured in Changchun, then of rubber-tired carts drawn by horses, then of rubber-tired carts drawn and pushed by men, then of wheelbarrows, and lastly of men with the traditional pole and two baskets. This juxtaposition of ancient and modern is not difficult to understand and what is significant is not the survival of the old but the setting of the future pattern by the new. Needless to say, even the casual tourist notices the abundance of labor in the service occupations.

As to the ability of the Chinese labor force, no one has ever questioned their aptitude and quick intelligence. The garden nature of Chinese agriculture seems to have endowed the Chinese people with an exceptional manual dexterity, and in all the factories I visited there were skilled workers who had been peasants only a few years before (the unity of the working class and the peasantry is physical as well as political). I was informed by one foreign professor that, given adequate training, Chinese surgeons are at least as good as any in the world.

Another point worth making is the strikingly high level of the chief directors of the agricultural producers' cooperatives. I visited several cooperatives in different parts of the country. In each case the director had been illiterate before 1949. In each case he or she had a thorough knowledge of all the relevant facts concerning the coop's past and present operations, as well as a good analytical understanding of the major issues of agrarian policy insofar as they af-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fected his or her cooperative. While the cooperatives I saw were all located near large cities and were to that extent not necessarily typical, it is nevertheless legitimate to infer that there are vast reserves of energy and ability in the countryside which are being increasingly unleashed.

The basic structure of the Chinese economy is now socialist, although there is still a lot of small scale and petty commerce which is being more and more integrated into cooperatives wherever possible. In industry, private enterprise now accounts for only a fraction of 1 percent of output; and in agriculture, except for minority areas such as Tibet, socialization has now been largely completed—under 3 percent of the peasantry are not in cooperatives.

It is already safe to say that in the main the socialization of industry, commerce, and agriculture has been peacefully and successfully carried through without any sizeable sabotage. While the technical and administrative difficulties attendant upon the peaceful socialist transformation of industry and commerce should not be underestimated, the tasks were far simpler, economically as well as politically, than in agriculture. To have achieved collectivization of agriculture without its mechanization in so short a time-span is in itself a revolutionary innovation of world-historical significance, a significance which is enhanced by the fact that this revolution was carried through without resort to duress. As is clear from several recent speeches by Nehru, the Chinese precedent has made a deep impression in India, though it is yet to be seen whether cooperativization can succeed prior to thorough-going land reform.

Chinese planning is generally cautious and realistic, both in detail and *en gros*. This conclusion is fully borne out not only by the achievements in socialization but also by the systematic over-fulfilment of First Five Year Plan goals. The original First Five Year Plan target for gross industrial output for 1957 called for an approximate doubling of the 1952 level. This target was exceeded *in 1956*, and 1957 should show a further increase of not less than 10 percent, so that the actual 1957 increase on 1952 should be of the order of 130 percent. In agriculture the original target of 192 million tons of grain by 1957 was attained in 1956 despite adverse weather conditions in that year, and the final results for 1957 should show a 2-3 percent overfulfilment of the original First Five Year Plan goal for gross agricultural output. This is an especially creditable performance since weather conditions were markedly favorable in only one year, 1955, which was a bumper year. They were markedly unfavorable in 1954 and 1956, and by no means favorable in 1953 and 1957. There can be little doubt but that the agricultural co-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

operatives deserve a large part of the credit for the sustained progress of 1956 and 1957.

That Chinese planning is realistic, and sensitive to old mistakes and new developments, is readily apparent in the current campaign against *le gigantisme pour soi,* and in the greater role to be given to medium and smaller scale plants, in the coal and iron and steel industries among others, under the Second Five Year Plan. This realism is also apparent in the recent and related decentralization program which is designed to raise industrial efficiency by promoting regional and local initiative and responsibility in the actual operation of a large range of industrial enterprises.

Similarly, the revised Draft Twelve Year Program for Agriculture modifies a number of the goals for 1967 set in the earlier version which was drawn up at the beginning of 1956, while at the same time retaining most of the ambitious targets for 1967 as originally formulated. These modifications usually consist in downward revisions of specific goals or, which comes to the same thing, in making previously general goals more concrete and determinate. The one prominent exception is the new target for the production of chemical fertilizers, which calls for an output of 5-7 million tons by 1962 and of 15 million tons by 1967. It is therefore clear that China is determined to build a large-scale chemical industry during the course of the Second Five Year Plan.

Perhaps it is in the nature of things that the process of correcting errors involves their over-correction. In any case, over-correction is scarcely avoidable in an economy in which agriculture accounts for half the net national income (on the narrow Communist definition) and which is still accumulating the experience necessary for accurate all-round planning. It should be noted that the over-correction of errors is partly of a paper character and is to that extent innocuous. To give but one example. After the remarkable and probably somewhat excessive upsurge of 1956, the Annual Plan for 1957 originally called for an increase of a little over 6 percent in gross industrial output, which was obviously unrealistically conservative within the Chinese framework of rapid economic development. But this target was revised upwards to 10-11 percent in the light of the experience of the first half of the year, and it should be no occasion for surprise if even this figure is overshot. Chou En-lai was unquestionably right when, in his Report on the Proposals for the Second Five Year Plan, he criticized the tendency to overestimate the objective possibilities in years of rapid expansion, such as 1956, and to underestimate them in years when the pace of advance is noticeably smaller, as in 1955 or for that matter 1957.

(*To be concluded*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD EVENTS

By Scott Nearing

Plowshares Into Swords

There is an old military axiom: "Every tool is a potential weapon." The axiom is based on the thousand-year long practice of converting technological improvements into implements of defense-offense.

Modern students of the history of invention and discovery have pointed to another important fact. Responding to the urgencies of military necessity, governments frequently subsidize inventions and put them to military use before they are employed in peacetime economy. When the Manhattan Project was organized, scientists, engineers, and technicians were assembled and given an assignment: to produce an atom bomb. Until the bombs had wrecked Hiroshima and Nagasaki, peacetime uses of atomic energy received slight consideration. Two billion dollars were spent on the Manhattan Project in order to create a weapon of sufficient destructiveness to "win the war."

After the war's end, the same practices continued. Atomic information was top-secret and had at all costs to be kept from the cold-war "enemy." Atomic bombs were stock-piled. An atomic submarine, atomic artillery, and guided missiles with atomic war-heads were designed and produced before serious consideration was given to the peacetime uses of atomic energy. For a decade the new science of atomics was directed toward destruction. Only later was it seriously considered as a source of energy for production and construction.

October 4, 1957 witnessed man's first faltering step into a new field: outer space. The sputniks designed and launched by Russian scientists were not weapons in any sense of the word. Sputnik I was experimental. Sputnik II carried recording instruments and a passenger, to test the possibility of space travel for living creatures.

Western responses to the inauguration of the new science of space travel have been more bellicose in the United States than elsewhere. With the Pentagon holding the whip hand of domestic political power, and with one of the Old Guard generals in the White House, it was to be expected that the prospect of space travel would be approached, as the conquest of the atom had been approached,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the military angle.

President Eisenhower's November 13, 1957, speech in Oklahoma City gave the Pentagon's full-dress answer to space travel achievements in the Soviet Union. The President proposed (1) the further development of United States nuclear power: bomb production, bomb tests, guided missiles carrying nuclear war-heads; (2) strengthening the blocs and alliances with which the Old World has been trying to encircle and strangle the New World; (3) increased expenditures for military purposes; (4) building up stock-piles of strategic materials in preparation for war. To be sure, the President mentioned peace, but his program of action was a war program which continues the cold war policy inaugurated in 1946.

Evidently the West intends to handle space travel as it handled atomics—as a handmaid of war. If this analysis is correct, scientists and inventors who contribute new formulas or new devices must expect to have their brain-children snatched up by the military and used for destructive rather than constructive purposes. Consequently, the greater the speed of scientific and technological advance, the more rapidly mankind will approach the precipice of self-destruction.

Obvious conclusions flow from this analysis. At the moment, men of good will must turn their attention away from discovery and invention to the immediate task of abolishing war. So long as the holders of power beat plowshares into swords, every advance in science and engineering is a possible step toward the annihilation of human life on the planet. Whatever benefits mankind may derive ultimately from the extraordinary developments of the present epoch (when man has conquered the air, released the energy of the atom, and begun the penetration of space) may be lost in another orgy of wholesale destruction and mass murder.

However irksome it may be for women and men of talent and genius to turn from the joys of creative discovery to the humdrum tasks of shaping public opinion and directing public policy away from war and toward peace, unless world leaders take this necessary step now, the extensive production of strontium 90 and of other radioactive residues of atomic and nuclear explosions may thrust the leaders and the led alike into the abyss of annihilation.

We realize that all creative human beings are piqued by requirements which shift their attention from ultimates to immediate demands, particularly in the littered shambles of world politics. But the drive to abolish war as an instrument of public policy is not a matter of personal preference. Rather it is the overriding necessity of this very moment in history, when, as Einstein so well said, we must disarm or die.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Going It Together

Eighty-two nations, each sovereign in legal theory, are now members of the United Nations. UN membership has not yet reached the level of the Universal Postal Union, but it is approaching that figure—thus making One World a political reality.

Universality has already been achieved in communication and transportation. Exchange of goods is planet-wide, though there are tariffs, subsidies and other restrictions. Payments for goods and other financial transactions are curtailed by the multiplicity of currencies, their instability, and by currency restrictions. Travel (subject to passports, visa, and currency controls) is widespread. Migration is still sharply curtailed. In various specialized fields such as science, sport, music, the arts, education, public health, a world opinion exists and functions, despite drawbacks and governmental limitations.

Nationalism persists and dominates certain important aspects of human relations, such as the private ownership and control of natural resources (including land); national governments and national laws; the production and use of armaments; the theory of national sovereignty, and the cult of patriotism.

Offsets and antidotes to all of these pro-national forces either exist or would be easy to establish. First, the United Nations (together with its many departments and specialized activities) is a limited but existing inter-national force. Second, other special international agencies such as the Universal Postal Union have had a long history of useful service. Third, the world-wide popular demand for an end to atom bomb tests, for disarmament, and for the official abandonment and abolition of war. Fourth, the establishment of a world economic authority, with some measure of control over international trade, commerce, exchange, transportation, travel and migration, with an inter-national currency and a department devoted to the conservation of natural resources and the apportionment of rare or unusual metals and minerals among the people who need them. Such an economic world authority would go far toward preventing tension and conflict over nature's bountiful stores.

Barrow Lyons, in a 1955 book published by Funk and Wagnalls, covers important aspects of this problem in his *Tomorrow's Birthright*. The issue may be put in a sentence: Shall men fight wasteful cold and hot wars over Persian oil and African copper and uranium, or shall we recognize all natural gifts as a common heritage of the human family and treat them accordingly?

To Equal and Excel

Life in the United States was disturbed by Sputnik I. It was decidedly upset by Sputnik II. Editorial comment called attention to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the "major psychological triumph" scored by the Soviet Union. The Defense Department proposed an all-out space project that would match or surpass the Soviet initiative by putting into space something bigger and better than the Soviet Union satellite. Such comment is based on the assumption that Soviet sputnik launching was in the nature of a chance occurrence, which might be equalled or excelled by a like chance occurrence in North America. A review of the essential facts shows the falsity of the assumption.

We might begin our review with the elementary schools. The basic unit of Soviet education is a ten year school, housed in one building. There are 650 such schools in Moscow alone. Children enter at 7 and leave at about 17. The ten year school provides training in the three R's, in two languages other than Russian, in arithmetic, algebra and geometry, biology, in physics and chemistry, geography and history, in a variety of manual activities and in sport. Following the ten year schools there are trade schools, the institutes, and for the students with the best grades, the universities—leading to careers in the sciences, professions, and arts. All of this education is free, with stipends for many students (80 percent in Moscow University) and an immense social pressure on all children to go as far through school as they are able.

Foreign languages taught in Soviet ten year schools include English, German, French, Spanish, and Italian. English tops the list, with some ten million Soviet children studying that language. In the United States this year, only 4,000 college students and no elementary school students are studying Russian.

Soviet children take their schools quietly and seriously. They are purposeful, orderly, disciplined, and work hard.

Turn to books. The *British Bookseller* reports the yearly output of book titles in the Soviet Union as 50,109. The same publication gives the figure for the United States as 11,901 or a fifth of the Soviet output.

A library of Foreign Literature in Moscow collects everything which they consider important published outside the Soviet Union and everything published in the Soviet Union about foreign countries. This library, staffed by 300 people and directed by a veteran woman librarian, now has two million volumes on its shelves. Its new building is planned for eight million volumes. The chief task of the staff is the preparation and publication of complete lists of foreign publications, arranged by countries and distributed to libraries and other institutions throughout the Soviet Union.

Each year Soviet institutes and universities turn out more than twice as many scientists and engineers as the like institutions in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States.

Ministries of Education and the Soviet Academy of Sciences, with a staff of 100,000 trained specialists, coordinate and direct the activities in their various fields.

Schools, plus books, plus libraries, plus directed planning and research equal Sputniks, jet passenger planes, and many other things.

If, as the *Times* of London recently reported, Washington is preparing an all-out campaign to "catch up with the Russians," a beginning must be made with the health of American children between birth and school age. Infinite care is devoted to this subject in the Soviet Union. Then must come money and more money for schools and their equipment, with the pupils taking education seriously, preserving educational discipline, and working hard on a curriculum including foreign languages, mathematics, chemistry, physics and biology right down into the elementary schools. Then must come free higher education, with generous scholarships for millions of students.

After that, there must be an immense expansion in the publication and distribution of information and an up-grading of the entire educational apparatus, until top educators, scientists, and technicians receive the same salaries and enjoy the same social rating as cabinet ministers.

Washington cannot hope to catch up with the Russians until it is prepared to give the entire process of education and enlightenment a top priority in terms of money and social preferment. To equal and excel the Russians, Americans must study harder, learn more, and apply their knowledge to the upbuilding of individual and social life.

Caught Short

Zhukov's demotion, early in November, 1957, gave Allen Dulles' Central Intelligence Agency an opportunity to justify its existence. The C.I.A. flopped. But it flopped in a vacuum. Nobody was home. *Newsweek,* Nov. 4, 1927, summarized the debacle in these words:

> Western officials obviously were caught by surprise. . . . When Allen Dulles' Central Intelligence Agency telephoned the news to the State Department, all top Soviet experts were away for the weekend. 'We haven't got anything from our sources yet anyway', the C.I.A. confessed. President Eisenhower got the news . . . between halves of a football game at Annapolis.

If *Newsweek* is right on its facts, and we have no reason to doubt them, it seems evident that Washington, like London, governs five days and then goes off for a weekend.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A European Rumor

There is a rumor going the rounds in Europe that the Americans could have put the first baby moon into the upper atmosphere had they been less ambitious. The unimaginative Russians were satisfied with a satellite which merely repeated "Beep-Beep-Beep". The Americans wanted their satellite to say "Coca-Cola-Coca-Cola-Coca-Cola" and that took more doing.

Diplomatic Raillery in Moscow

Washington dispatches to European capitals are heavy with sanctimonious phrases and contradictions between word and deed. Moscow dispatches crackle and sparkle with diplomatic wise-cracks. On October 30 the Paris press reported the verbal exchanges when Khrushchev attended a Turkish Embassy Party to signal the end of the Syria Crisis.

"Turkey and the Soviet Union are neighbors," said Khrushchev. "When Turkey gets hot, the cold wind coming down from the Soviet Union meets the hot wind blowing from Turkey, and the result for both of us is a moderate climate."

Turning to the ambassadors of Great Britain and the United States, Khrushchev went on, "We will join NATO if you will join the Warsaw Pact. Of course this is a gesture, but if you will notice, the indicator on the dial is moving slightly toward peace."

"Ah!" he called out exuberantly, "Good day, Mr. Ambassador from Switzerland! Lenin lived in Switzerland. Let us raise our glasses to Switzerland! And you, Mr. Ambassador from Yugoslavia, which belongs to no bloc! I love people like that. Really! Do you agree, Mr. Ambassador from the United States?"

To the journalists present, Mr. Khrushchev said later, "If you have confidence in the Soviet Government, not only you but your children and grandchildren will be able to sleep in peace."

When a great democracy cynically enters into alliances with totalitarian governments, when it supports openly a corrupt status quo, *or when it displays a thinly disguised contempt for those who resist taking sides, the result is to undermine confidence in the philosophy that permits these things to happen. We believe that anti-communist hysteria, whether reflected in foreign policy or in domestic policy, is exacting a heavy toll on the standing of American democracy at home and abroad.*

—American Friends Service Committee, *Speak Truth To Power.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

QUOTATIONS FROM VEBLEN

We had intended to include the following quotations, picked from a half dozen or so of Veblen's books, in last summer's memorial issue, but were prevented by lack of space. For those readers who have joined us recently, another selection of quotations from Veblen was run in the issue of September, 1957.—THE EDITORS

In the last analysis it is the frame of mind of the common man that makes the foundation of society in the modern world; even though the elder statesmen continue to direct its motion from day to day by the light of those principles that were found good some time before yesterday.

The motive of business is pecuniary gain, the method is essentially purchase and sale. The aim and usual outcome is an accumulation of wealth. Men whose aim is not increase of possessions do not go into business, particularly not on an independent footing.

Each concern must advertise, chiefly because the others do. The aggregate expenditure that could advantageously be put into advertising in the absence of competition would undoubtedly be but an inconsiderable fraction of what is actually incurred, and necessarily incurred under existing circumstances.

Work that is, on the whole, useless or detrimental to the community at large may be as gainful to the business man and to the workman whom he employs as work that contributes substantially to the aggregate livelihood.

Under the more fully developed business system as it has stood during the close of the century dull times are, in a way, the course of nature; whereas brisk times are an exceptional invention of man or a rare bounty of Providence.

The usual and more effectual impetus to an era of prosperity . . . is some form of wasteful expenditure, as, e.g., a sustained war demand or the demand due to the increase of armaments, naval and military, or again, such an interference with the course of business as is wrought by a differentially protective tariff. . . . These methods, it will be noticed, are, in their primary incidence, of the nature of a waste of industrial output or energy; but the prosperity achieved

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is, none the less, to be recognized as a beneficial outcome in point of heightened industrial activity as well as in point of increased comfort for the industrial classes.

The contemplated move [reform to effect a redistribution of income] is manifestly chimerical in any community, such as the modern industrial communities, where public policy is with growing singleness of purpose guided by business interests with a naive view to an increase of profits.

It seldom happens, if at all, that the government of a civilized nation will persist in a course of action detrimental or not ostensibly subservient to the interests of the more conspicuous body of the community's business men. The degree in which a government fails to adapt its policy to these business exigencies is the measure of its senility.

International business relations, it is well said, make for peace; in the sense, of course, that they enforce the pacification of recalcitrant barbarians and lead to contention between civilized nations for a revision of the peace terms.

When warlike emulation between states of somewhat comparable force has once got under way it assumes a cumulative character; so that a scale of expenditure for armaments which would at the outset have seemed absurdly impossible comes presently to be accepted as a matter of course.

War and preoccupation with warlike enterprise breed a warlike animus in the community, as well as a habit of arbitrary, autocratic rule on the part of those in authority and an unquestioning, enthusiastic subservience on the part of the subjects.

It is not a question of what ought to be done, but of what is to take place.

The largest and most promising factor of cultural discipline—most promising as a corrective of iconoclastic vagaries—over which business principles rule is national politics. . . . Business interests urge an aggressive national policy and business men direct it. Such a policy is warlike as well as patriotic. The direct cultural value of a warlike business policy is unequivocal. It makes for a conservative animus on the part of the populace. . . . They learn to think in war-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like terms of rank, authority, and subordination, and so grow progressively more tolerant of encroachments on their civil rights.

The quest of profits leads to a predatory national policy.

Now, this red line of cleavage, in material interest and in sentiment, runs not between those who own something and those who own nothing, as has habitually been set out in the formulas of the doctrinaires, but between those who own more than they personally can use and those who have urgent use for more than they own.

American law and procedure have taken shape under the hand of legislatures and courts which have habitually and as a matter of course been made up of investors and lawyers, with no control from outside these classes; and the upshot of it has been an arrangement such as to serve the convenience and profit of these two classes of persons— such as to increase the cost, volume, uncertainty and intricacy of litigation.

As once at the call of the anointed princes, so now at the call of a businesslike imperialist policy, the nation's citizen has no rights which the nation's politicians are bound to respect, except such property rights as are identified with business transactions on a reasonably large scale. So, the democratic commonwealths have fallen back on the ancient footing of intolerance, coercion, and furtive jobbery, that belongs of right to the statecraft of despotism and predation by the Grace of God.

By stress of this all-pervading patriotic bias and that fantastic bigotry which enables civilized men to believe in a national solidarity of material interests, it has come now to pass that the chief—virtually sole—concern of the constituted authorities in any democratic nation is a concern about the profitable business of the nation's substantial citizens.

Ownership confers a legal right of sabotage, and absentee ownership vests the owner with the power of sabotage at a distance, by help of the constituted authorities whose duty it is to enforce the legal rights of citizens.

The strategy of business—the strategy of getting a larger net gain in dollars—dictates what is to be done or left undone; and having so dictated, it moves on to the next thing in the same line. There is no place in Big Business for considerations of a more material sort

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or of a more sentimental sort than net gain within the law. . . . Neither the tenuous things of the human spirit nor the gross material needs of human life can come in contact with this business enterprise in such a way as to deflect its course from the line of least resistance, which is the line of greatest present gain within the law.

The whole duty of salesmanship is to sell dear and deliver a minimum.

The bias of salesmanship . . . is to get a margin of something for nothing, and the wider the margin the more perfect the salesman's work.

The means of "getting ahead" is also the means of "keeping up." Any concern which neglects its opportunities and falls behind is in a way to fall out of the game. The net aggregate result is a competitive multiplication of the ways and means of salesmanship at a competitively increasing net aggregate cost. The selling-cost of the goods sold rises accordingly, and the price to the consumer rises to meet the enhanced selling-cost. The rising cost of salesmanship becomes a rising overhead charge on the business, regulated by the pressure of competitive selling, but hitherto trending upwards, apparently with a gradually accelerated rise.

Commercial sales-publicity of the secular sort evidently falls short, hitherto, in respect of the pitch and volume of make-believe which can be put over effectually and profitably. But it also falls short conspicuously at another critical point. It is of the nature of sales-publicity, to promise much and deliver a minimum. . . . Worked out to its ideal finish, as in the promises and performance of the publicity-agents of the Faith, it should be the high good fortune of the perfect salesman in the secular field also to promise everything and deliver nothing.

Business-as-usual and the national integrity are joint and integral factors in that complex of habits of thought that makes up the official mentality; so that any irritation of the official sensibilities along either line will unavoidably bring a response along the two together and indiscriminately. In that parallelogram of forces in which business principles and the sense of national integrity combine jointly to move and direct the democratic officials there is no distinguishing the two joint factors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR Associates Lecture Series

Wed. Jan. 15

Paul M. Sweezy—REPORT ON EUROPE

Heywood Broun Room, Newspaper Guild
133 W. 44th St., N. Y. 8:30 P.M.

Wed. Feb. 26

Scott Nearing—WORLD REPORT

Corliss Lamont—THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL

Academy Hall
853 Broadway (near 14th St.), N. Y. 8:30 P.M.

Wed. May 14 ANNUAL BIRTHDAY PARTY

Leo Huberman

Paul M. Sweezy

Other speakers to be announced

Heywood Broun Room, Newspaper Guild
133 W. 44th St., N. Y. 8:30 P.M.

Admission (each meeting):
In Advance $1 . . . At the door, $1.25 . . . Associates free.

Save money by sending for your tickets now.
Be sure to enclose your check.

Monthly Review Associates 66 Barrow Street New York 14, N. Y.

I enclose $..... for ..... tickets

☐ for Jan. 15 ☐ for Feb. 26 ☐ for May 14

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

For Associates only:
I am an Associate for 1957-1958. Please send me a free ticket

☐ for Jan. 15 ☐ for Feb. 26 ☐ for May 14

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUB AND BOOK OFFERS

Monthly Review, 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, N. Y.

I enclose:

☐ $4 for a one-year subscription

☐ $7 for a two-year subscription

☐ $5 for a one-year sub plus one of the following books:
..... THE BENDING CROSS by Ray Ginger (list price $5)
..... MAN'S WORLDLY GOODS by Leo Huberman (paper edition)

☐ $6 for a one-year sub plus one of the following books:
..... WAS JUSTICE DONE? by Malcolm P. Sharp (list price $3.50)
..... SOCIALISTS AROUND THE WORLD by Helen and Scott Nearing (list price $3)

☐ $7 for a one-year sub plus one of the following books:
..... A NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM? by Konni Zilliacus (list price $5)
..... THE SOUTH AFRICAN TREASON TRIAL by Forman and Sachs (list price $5)
..... THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF GROWTH by Paul A. Baran (list price $5)
..... AMERICAN RADICALS ed. by Harvey Goldberg (list price $5)
..... THE PRESENT AS HISTORY by Paul M. Sweezy (list price $5)
..... THE CHINESE ECONOMY by Solomon Adler (list price $5)

☐ $8 for a one-year sub plus one of the following books:
..... THE GREAT ROAD by Agnes Smedley (list price $6.75)
..... THE THEORY OF CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT by Paul M. Sweezy (list price $6)

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Zone ..... State .....

☐ This is a new subscription ☐ This is a renewal

All prices include postage. Send your order, with payment enclosed, to Monthly Review, 66 Barrow Street, New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*continued from inside front cover*)

Pondering, as we frequently do, the problem of how best to widen the audience for socialism, we were struck with the simple truth contained in this bit of doggerel from *Veni Vidi,* an old subscriber:

"Get a horse," the yokels shouted, sure the gas car was a joke.
Everybody "knew" the answer: The inventors would go broke!

"Get a horse," the yokels shouted, sure all social aims are jokes.
Everybody "knows" the answer: All the socialists are dopes.

Knowing all the things for certain, all the things that are not so
Is the curse of untaught people; *not the things they do not know.*

One thing that an increasing number of people *do* know is that we must all redouble our efforts for peace. Leaflets and cards containing extremely useful material for those of your friends who may still not be aware of the danger of the continued arms race, can be obtained, free of charge, from Promoting Enduring Peace, 489 Ocean Avenue, West Haven, Conn.

Solomon Adler, the author of MR Press book *The Chinese Economy,* writes us:

> I regret that the book contains two gross errors of fact which are inexcusable oversights. First, the eastern part of the frontier between China and Vietnam is drawn too far south in the two end-paper maps. Second, what was formerly the province of Sinkiang is now the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Region and *not* the Sinkiang Uighur Autonomous Republic (pp. 144 and 153). There are Autonomous Regions but no Autonomous Republics in the People's Republic of China. In contradistinction to the Soviet Union, which is a union of republics, China is a unitary republic.
>
> I should greatly appreciate it if any other errors I have missed are called to my attention.

Memo to subscribers from our circulation department: if you are moving and want the next month's issue delivered to your new address, you must let us know of the change by the 15th of the preceding month.

Replies to our *Who Are You?* questionnaire are still being collated. The response was so tremendous that it will take us much longer to tally the replies than we had anticipated. Our volunteer counters have improvised an ingenious home-made computer which is supposed to correlate answers with the speed of an IBM machine. If it works, we should be publishing the results before long.

MR Associates invites you to hear

PAUL M. SWEEZY

Report on Europe

Time: Wednesday, January 15, 8:30 P.M.
Place: Heywood Broun Room, Newspaper Guild
133 W. 44th St. N. Y.
Admission: $1 in advance . . . $1.25 at the door . . .
Associates, free.

Send for tickets to MR Associates, 66 Barrow St., New York 14, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This pamphlet tells—

why the right to travel is vital to every American

what our State Department has done, by restricting travel and denying passports, to interfere with this important freedom

how through court cases and an aroused public opinion the battle for our right to travel is being waged

THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL

by Corliss Lamont

Tells how we came from this

Magna Carta, 1215 A.D.: "It shall be lawful . . . unless in time of war . . . for anyone to leave and return to our kingdom."

and this

United Nations, 1948, Universal Declaration of Human Rights: "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

to this

U.S.A., 1957: "The Department of State currently denies permission to all American citizens, with certain official exceptions, to travel to China, Albania, Bulgaria, North Korea and North Vietnam. . . . In addition, the Department arbitrarily denies to some American citizens permission to travel abroad anywhere. These limitations on the right to travel are enforced through a refusal to issue passports."

—Editorial in **The Washington Post**

40 pp. **10c**

BASIC PAMPHLETS, Dept. M

Box 42, Cathedral Station, New York 25, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED